

On large k -ended trees in connected graphs

Zh.G. Nikoghosyan*

March 26, 2015

Abstract

A vertex of degree one is called an end-vertex, and an end-vertex of a tree is called a leaf. A tree with at most k leaves is called a k -ended tree. For a positive integer k , let t_k be the order of a largest k -ended tree. Let σ_m be the minimum degree sum of an independent set of m vertices. The main result (Theorem 2) provides a lower bound for t_{k+1} in terms of σ_m and relative orders: if G is a connected graph and k, λ, m are positive integers with $2 \leq m \leq \min\{k, \lambda\} + 1$ then either $t_{k+1} \geq \sigma_m + \lambda(k - m + 1) + 1$ or $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$.

Key words. Hamilton path, dominating path, longest path, degree sums, k -ended tree, dominating k -ended tree, relative order.

1 Introduction

Throughout this article we consider only finite undirected graphs without loops or multiple edges. The set of vertices of a graph G is denoted by $V(G)$ and the set of edges by $E(G)$. A good reference for any undefined terms is [1].

For a graph G , we use n , δ and α to denote the order (the number of vertices), the minimum degree and the independence number of G , respectively. If $\alpha \geq k$ for some integer k , let σ_k be the minimum degree sum of an independent set of k vertices; otherwise we let $\sigma_k = +\infty$. For a subset $S \subseteq V(G)$, we denote by $G[S]$ the subgraph of G induced by S .

If Q is a path or a cycle in a graph G , then the order of Q , denoted by $|Q|$, is $|V(Q)|$. Each vertex and edge in G can be interpreted as simple cycles of orders 1 and 2, respectively. The graph G is hamiltonian if G contains a Hamilton cycle, i.e. a cycle containing every vertex of G . A cycle (path, tree) Q of G is said to be dominating if $V(G - Q)$ is an independent set of vertices.

We write a cycle Q with a given orientation by $\vec{Q}$. For $x, y \in V(Q)$, we denote by $x\vec{Q}y$ the subpath of Q in the chosen direction from x to y . For $x \in V(Q)$, we denote the h -th successor and the h -th predecessor of x on $\vec{Q}$

*G.G. Nicoghossian (up to 1997)

by x^{+h} and x^{-h} , respectively. We abbreviate x^{+1} and x^{-1} by x^+ and x^- , respectively. We say that vertex z_1 precedes vertex z_2 on $\vec{Q}$ if z_1, z_2 occur on $\vec{Q}$ in this order, and indicate this relationship by $z_1 \prec z_2$.

A vertex of degree one is called an end-vertex, and an end-vertex of a tree is usually called a leaf. The set of end-vertices of G is denoted by $End(G)$. A spanning tree is called independence if $End(G)$ is independent in G . A branch vertex of a tree is a vertex of degree at least three. The set of branch vertices of a tree T will be denoted by $B(T)$. A tailing of a tree T is a path in T connecting any end-vertex of T to a predecessor of a nearest branch vertex. For a positive integer k , a tree T is said to be a k -ended tree if $|End(T)| \leq k$. A Hamilton path is a spanning 2-ended tree. A Hamilton cycle can be interpreted as a spanning 1-ended tree. In particular, K_2 can be interpreted as a hamiltonian graph and as a 1-ended tree. We denote by t_k the order of a largest k -ended tree in G . In particular, t_1 is the order of a longest cycle (the circumference), and t_2 is the order of a longest path in G .

We first present two simple properties of k -ended trees with relative orders $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$ when $\lambda \in \{1, 2\}$. For $\lambda = 1$, the following can be checked easily.

Proposition 1. Let G be a connected graph and k a positive integer. Then G has a spanning k -ended tree if and only if $t_k = t_{k+1}$.

For $\lambda = 2$, we have the dominating version of Proposition 1.

Proposition 2. Let G be a connected graph with $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - 1$ for some positive integer k . Then every largest k -ended tree in G is a dominating tree.

Proof. Let G be a connected graph with $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - 1$ for some $k \geq 1$ and T_k a largest k -ended tree in G . Suppose the contrary, that is $G - T_k$ contains a component H with $|H| \geq 2$. Now it is easy to construct a $(k+1)$ -ended tree T_{k+1} that contains all vertices of T_k and at least 2 vertices of H . Then $t_{k+1} \geq |T_{k+1}| \geq t_k + 2$, contradicting $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - 1$. $\triangle$

Our starting point is the earliest degree sum condition for a graph to be hamiltonian due to Ore [5].

Theorem A [5]. Every graph with $\sigma_2 \geq n$ is hamiltonian.

The analog of Theorem A for Hamilton paths follows easily.

Theorem B [5]. Every graph with $\sigma_2 \geq n - 1$ has a Hamilton path.

In 1971, Las Vergnas [3] gave a degree condition that guarantees that any forest in G of limited size and with a limited number of leaves can be extended to a spanning tree of G with a limited number of leaves in an appropriate sense. This result implies as a corollary a degree sum condition for the existence of a tree with at most k leaves including Theorem A and Theorem B as special cases

for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$, respectively.

Theorem C [2], [3], [4]. Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq n - k + 1$ for some positive integer k . Then G has a spanning k -ended tree.

However, Theorem C was first openly formulated and proved in 1976 by the author [4] and was reproved in 1998 by Broersma and Tuinstra [2].

In this paper we first present a non-degree sum condition for relative orders t_k and t_{k+1} .

Theorem 1. Let G be a connected graph and let k and λ be positive integers with $k \geq 2$. If $\lambda \geq t_{k+1}/(k+1)$, then $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$.

Since $n \geq t_{k+1}$, Theorem 1 implies the following immediately.

Corollary 1. Let G be a connected graph and let k and λ be positive integers with $k \geq 2$. If $\lambda \geq n/(k+1)$, then $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$.

The next relation follows from Theorem 1 for a special case when $\lambda = \lfloor t_{k+1}/(k+1) \rfloor$.

Corollary 2. Let G be a connected graph. Then for each integer $k \geq 2$,

$$t_k \geq \frac{k}{k+1}t_{k+1} + \frac{1}{k+1}.$$

The next two results of this paper provide a generalized degree sum conditions for trees with few leaves in connected graphs including Theorems A, B, C, D as special cases.

Theorem 2. Let G be a connected graph and let k, λ, m be positive integers with $2 \leq m \leq \min\{k, \lambda\} + 1$. Then either

$$t_{k+1} \geq \sigma_m + \lambda(k - m + 1) + 1$$

or $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$.

Theorem 3. Let G be a connected graph and let k, λ, m be positive integers with $m \leq \min\{k, \lambda\} + 1$. If

$$\sigma_m \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda(k - m + 1)$$

then $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$.

Theorem 3 follows from Theorem 2 immediately. The graph

$$G_1 = (k+1)K_\lambda + K_1 \equiv (mK_\lambda \cup (k-m+1)K_\lambda) + K_1$$

shows that the condition $\sigma_m \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda(k - m + 1)$ in Theorem 3 cannot be relaxed to $\sigma_m \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda(k - m + 1) - 1$.

Next, the graph

$$G_2 = (k + 1)K_{\lambda-1} + K_1 \equiv (mK_{\lambda-1} \cup (k - m + 1)K_{\lambda-1}) + K_1$$

shows that the conclusion $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$ in Theorem 3 cannot be strengthened to $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 2$ when $m \leq k$. If $m = k + 1$ then for this purpose we can use the graph $(k + 2)K_{k-1} + K_2$ when $k \geq 2$, and the complete bipartite graph $K_{r,r}$ when $k = 1$. Thus, Theorem 3 is best possible.

Theorem 3 implies a number of results in more popular terminology, including Ore-type versions, as well as their spanning k -ended and dominating k -ended versions.

Corollary 3 (Theorem 3, $n \geq t_{k+1}$).

Let G be a connected graph and let k, λ, m be positive integers with $m \leq \min\{k, \lambda\} + 1$. If

$$\sigma_m \geq n - \lambda(k - m + 1)$$

then $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$.

Corollary 4 (Theorem 3, $m = k + 1 = \lambda + 1$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_{k+1} \geq t_{k+1}$ for some positive integer k . Then $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - k + 1$.

Corollary 5 (Theorem 3, $m = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda(k - 1)$ for some positive integers λ, k . Then $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$.

Corollary 6 (Theorem 3, $m = 2, \lambda = 1$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq t_{k+1} - k + 1$ for some positive integer k . Then $t_k \geq t_{k+1}$.

Corollary 7 [2], [3], [4] (Theorem 3, $m = 2, \lambda = 1$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq n - k + 1$ for some positive integer k . Then G has a spanning k -ended tree.

Corollary 8 (Theorem 3, $m = 2, \lambda = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq t_{k+1} - 2k + 2$ for some positive integer k . Then $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - 1$.

Corollary 9 (Theorem 3, $m = 2, \lambda = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq n - 2k + 2$ for some positive integer k . Then G has a dominating k -ended tree.

Corollary 10 (Theorem 3, $m = 2, k = \lambda = 1$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq t_2$. Then $t_1 \geq t_2$.

Corollary 11 [5] (Theorem 3, $m = 2$, $k = \lambda = 1$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq n$. Then G is hamiltonian.

Corollary 12 (Theorem 3, $m = 2$, $\lambda = 1$, $k = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq t_3 - 1$. Then $t_2 \geq t_3$.

Corollary 13 [5] (Theorem 3, $m = 2$, $\lambda = 1$, $k = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq n - 1$. Then G has a Hamilton path.

Corollary 14 (Theorem 3, $m = 2$, $k = \lambda = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq t_3 - 2$. Then $t_2 \geq t_3 - 1$.

Corollary 15 (Theorem 3, $m = 2$, $k = \lambda = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_2 \geq n - 2$. Then G has a dominating path.

Corollary 16 (Theorem 3, $m = 3$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_3 \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda(k - 2)$ for some integers $k \geq 2$ and $\lambda \geq 2$. Then $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$.

Corollary 17 (Theorem 3, $m = 3$, $\lambda = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_3 \geq t_{k+1} - 2k + 4$ for some integer $k \geq 2$. Then $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - 1$.

Corollary 18 (Theorem 3, $m = 3$, $\lambda = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_3 \geq n - 2k + 4$ for some integer $k \geq 2$. Then G has a dominating k -ended tree.

Corollary 19 (Theorem 3, $m = 3$, $k = \lambda = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_3 \geq t_3$. Then $t_2 \geq t_3 - 1$.

Corollary 20 (Theorem 3, $m = 3$, $k = \lambda = 2$).

Let G be a connected graph with $\sigma_3 \geq n$. Then G has a dominating path.

2 Proofs

Proof of Theorem 1. For a connected graph G and positive integers λ and $k \geq 2$, let T_{k+1} be a $(k+1)$ -ended tree in G and let $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{k+1}$ be the tailings of T_{k+1} . Clearly, $T_{k+1} - A_i$ is a k -ended tree in G for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\}$. If $|A_i| \leq (t_{k+1} - 1)/(k+1)$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\}$, then

$$t_k \geq |T_{k+1} - A_i| = |T_{k+1}| - |A_i|$$

$$\geq t_{k+1} - \frac{t_{k+1} - 1}{k+1} = t_{k+1} - \lambda + \frac{1}{k+1},$$

implying that $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$.

Now let $|A_i| \geq t_{k+1}/(k+1)$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\}$. Since $k \geq 2$ and G is connected, T_{k+1} has a branch vertex x . By the definition, $x \notin A_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, k+1$). Then

$$t_{k+1} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} |A_i| + |\{x\}| \geq t_{k+1} + 1,$$

a contradiction. $\blacksquare$

Proof of Theorem 2. Let G be a connected graph and let k, λ, m be positive integers with $2 \leq m \leq \min\{k, \lambda\} + 1$. If $t_k \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1$ then we are done. Let

$$t_k \leq t_{k+1} - \lambda. \quad (1)$$

We shall prove that

$$t_{k+1} \geq \sigma_m + \lambda(k - m + 1) + 1. \quad (2)$$

Let T_{k+1} be a $(k+1)$ -ended tree in G and T_m be an m -ended subtree of T_{k+1} . Assume that

- (i) T_{k+1} is chosen so that $|E(T_{k+1})|$ is as large as possible,
- (ii) T_m is chosen so that $|E(T_m)|$ is as large as possible, subject to (i).

By the definition, $|T_{k+1}| = t_{k+1}$.

Claim 1. $|End(T_{k+1})| = k+1 \geq 2$.

Proof. Assume the contrary, that is $|End(T_{k+1})| \leq k$, implying that T_{k+1} is a k -ended tree. Since $\lambda \geq 1$, we have

$$t_k \geq |T_{k+1}| = t_{k+1} \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1,$$

contradicting (1). Hence, $|End(T_{k+1})| = k+1$. Recalling also that $k \geq 1$, we have $|End(T_{k+1})| \geq 2$. $\triangle$

Claim 2. T_{k+1} is an independence tree.

Proof. If two of the end-vertices of T_{k+1} are joined by an edge e , then $T_{k+1} + e$ has a unique cycle C . If C is a Hamilton cycle, then T_{k+1} is a 1-ended tree, contradicting Claim 1. Otherwise at least one vertex v of C has a degree at least three in $T_{k+1} + e$. Deleting one of the edges of C incident with v results in a k -ended tree T_k of order $|T_{k+1}|$. Then

$$t_k \geq |T_k| = |T_{k+1}| = t_{k+1} \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1,$$

contradicting (1). Hence, T_{k+1} is an independence tree. $\triangle$

Claim 3. If L is a tailing of a $(k+1)$ -ended tree T in G with $|T| = t_{k+1}$, then $|L| \geq \lambda$.

Proof. Assume the contrary, that is $|L| \leq \lambda - 1$ for some tailing L of T . Since $T - L$ is a k -ended tree, we have

$$t_k \geq |T - L| = |T| - |L| \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1,$$

contradicting (1). $\triangle$

Claim 4. If T is a k -ended tree in G then $|T| < t_{k+1}$.

Proof. Assume the contrary, that is $|T| \geq t_{k+1}$. Then

$$t_k \geq |T| \geq t_{k+1} \geq t_{k+1} - \lambda + 1,$$

contradicting (1). $\triangle$

Case 1. $|End(T_{k+1})| = 2$.

By Claim 1, $k = 1$ and $m = 2$, implying that T_2 is a longest path in G . Put $T_2 = v_1 v_2 \dots v_f$. By Claim 2, $v_1 v_f \notin E(G)$. By (i), $N(v_1) \cup N(v_f) \subseteq V(T_2)$. If $d(v_1) + d(v_f) \geq t_2$ then by standard arguments, $G[V(T_2)]$ is hamiltonian, that is $G[V(T_2)]$ contains a 1-ended tree (cycle) T_1 with $|T_1| = |T_2|$, contradicting Claim 4. Otherwise

$$t_{k+1} = t_2 \geq d(v_1) + d(v_f) + 1 \geq \sigma_2 + 1 = \sigma_m + \lambda(k - m + 1) + 1.$$

Case 2. $|End(T_{k+1})| \geq 3$.

Put $End(T_{k+1}) = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_{k+1}\}$. By (ii), $End(T_m) \subseteq End(T_{k+1})$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $End(T_m) = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_m\}$. If $\cup_{i=1}^m N(\xi_i) \not\subseteq V(T_m)$, then clearly G contains an m -ended subtree T'_m with $|E(T'_m)| > |E(T_m)|$, contradicting (ii). Hence,

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^m N(\xi_i) \subseteq V(T_m).$$

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, let $\vec{Q}_i = \xi_i \vec{Q}_i w_i$ be the tailing of T_{k+1} connecting ξ_i to the predecessor w_i of the nearest branch vertex w_i^* of T_{k+1} . By Claim 3, $|V(Q_i)| \geq \lambda$. Let w'_i be the vertex on Q_i with $|V(\xi_i \vec{Q}_i w'_i)| = \lambda$. Put

$$A_i = V(Q_i), \quad A'_i = V(\xi_i \vec{Q}_i w'_i) \quad (i = 1, \dots, k+1).$$

Claim 5. If $|T_m| \geq \sigma_m + 1$ then (2) holds.

Proof. Since $|A_i| \geq |V(Q_i)| \geq \lambda$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, we have

$$t_{k+1} = |T_{k+1}| = |T_m| + |T_{k+1} - T_m|$$

$$\geq \sigma_m + 1 + \sum_{i=m+1}^{k+1} |A_i| \geq \sigma_m + \lambda(k - m + 1) + 1,$$

and (2) holds. $\triangle$

To prove that $|T_m| \geq \sigma_m + 1$, which by Claim 5 implies (2), we use mathematical induction on m . Assume that $m = 2$ (induction basis). By (ii), $N(\xi_1) \cup N(\xi_2) \subseteq V(T_2)$. If $d(\xi_1) + d(\xi_2) \geq |T_2|$ then by standard arguments, $G[V(T_2)]$ is hamiltonian and we can form a k -ended tree T'_{k+1} of order $|T_{k+1}|$, contradicting Claim 4. Otherwise $|T_2| \geq d(\xi_1) + d(\xi_2) \geq \sigma_2 + 1$. Now suppose that (2) holds for $m - 1$, where $m \geq 3$.

Claim 6. Let $\mu \in A_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\}$. If $\xi_j \mu \in E(G)$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\} - \{i\}$, then $|\xi_i \vec{Q}_i \mu^-| \geq \lambda$ and $|\mu^+ \vec{Q}_i w_i| \geq \lambda$.

Proof. Put

$$T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_j \mu - w_i w_i^*.$$

By Claim 2, $\mu \neq \xi_i$. Next, we have $\mu \neq w_i$ since otherwise T'_{k+1} is a k -ended tree of order $|T_{k+1}|$, contradicting Claim 4. Then T'_{k+1} is a $(k+1)$ -ended tree with tailings $\xi_i \vec{Q}_i \mu^-$ and $\mu^+ \vec{Q}_i w_i$. By Claim 3, $|\xi_i \vec{Q}_i \mu^-| \geq \lambda$ and $|\mu^+ \vec{Q}_i w_i| \geq \lambda$. $\triangle$

Claim 7. Let $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in A_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\}$ and let $\mu_1 \prec \mu_2$. If $\xi_i \mu_2, \xi_j \mu_1 \in E(G)$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\} - \{i\}$, then $|\mu_1^+ \vec{Q}_i \mu_2^-| \geq \lambda$.

Proof. Put

$$T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_i \mu_2 + \xi_j \mu_1 - \mu_1 \mu_1^+ - w_i w_i^*.$$

If $\mu_1^+ = \mu_2$ then T'_{k+1} is a k -ended tree of order $|T_{k+1}|$, contradicting Claim 4. Otherwise T'_{k+1} is a $(k+1)$ -ended tree with tailing $\mu_1^+ \vec{Q}_i \mu_2^-$. By Claim 3, $|\mu_1^+ \vec{Q}_i \mu_2^-| \geq \lambda$. $\triangle$

Claim 8. Let $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in A_i$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\}$ and let $\mu_1 \prec \mu_2$. If $\xi_j \mu_1, \xi_t \mu_2 \in E(G)$ for some distinct $j, t \in \{1, 2, \dots, k+1\} - \{i\}$, then $|\mu_1^+ \vec{Q}_i \mu_2^-| \geq \lambda$.

Proof. Put

$$T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_j \mu_1 + \xi_t \mu_2 - \mu_1 \mu_1^+ - w_i w_i^*.$$

If $\mu_1^+ = \mu_2$ then T'_{k+1} is a k -ended tree of order $|T_{k+1}|$, contradicting Claim 4. Otherwise T'_{k+1} is a $(k+1)$ -ended tree with tailing $\mu_1^+ \vec{Q}_i \mu_2^-$. By Claim 3, $|\mu_1^+ \vec{Q}_i \mu_2^-| \geq \lambda$. $\triangle$

Claim 9. Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $i \neq j$. Then

$$N_{A_1}^{+(i-1)}(\xi_i) \cap N_{A_1}^{+(j-1)}(\xi_j) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Assume the contrary and let $\mu \in N_{A_1}^{+(i-1)}(\xi_i) \cap N_{A_1}^{+(j-1)}(\xi_j)$.

Assume first that $i \geq 2$ and $j \geq 2$. It follows that $\mu_1^{+(i-1)} = \mu_2^{+(j-1)} = \mu$ for some $\mu_1 \in N_{A_1}(\xi_i)$ and $\mu_2 \in N_{A_1}(\xi_j)$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $\mu_1 < \mu_2$, that is $j < i$. Then

$$|\mu_1^+ \vec{Q}_1 \mu_2^-| = i - j - 1 \leq m - 2 \leq \lambda - 1,$$

contradicting Claim 8.

Now assume that either $i = 1$ or $j = 1$, say $j = 1$. By the hypothesis, $\mu \in N_{A_1}(\xi_1) \cap N_{A_1}^{+(i-1)}(\xi_i)$. It follows that $\mu_1^{+(i-1)} = \mu$ for some $\mu_1 \in N_{A_1}(\xi_i)$. Then

$$|\mu_1^+ \vec{Q}_1 \mu^-| = i - 2 \leq m - 2 \leq \lambda - 1,$$

contradicting Claim 7. $\triangle$

Since $m \leq \lambda + 1$, by Claim 6, $N_{A_1}^{+(i-1)}(\xi_i) \subseteq A_1$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Next, it is easy to see that $\xi_1 \notin N_{A_1}^{+(i-1)}(\xi_i)$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Then by Claim 9,

$$|A_1| \geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{A_1}(\xi_i)| + |\{\xi_1\}| = \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{A_1}(\xi_i)| + 1.$$

By a similar argument, for each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$,

$$|A_j| \geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{A_j}(\xi_i)| + 1.$$

Put

$$A = \bigcup_{i=1}^m A_i.$$

Clearly,

$$|A| = \sum_{i=1}^m |A_i| \geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{A_i}(\xi_i)| + m. \quad (3)$$

Let Γ be the set of all paths in T_m with

(*) $M \in \Gamma$ if and only if $|M| \geq 2$ and $V(M) \cap B(T_{k+1}) = \text{End}(M)$.

Let $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_\pi$ be the elements of Γ . For each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \pi\}$, put

$$\vec{M}_i = x_i \vec{M}_i y_i, \quad D_i = V(M_i) - \{x_i, y_i\}.$$

For each $i \in \{1, \dots, \pi\}$, $T_m - D_i$ consists of two connected components, denoted by $T_m(x_i)$ and $T_m(y_i)$.

Case 2.1. $|D_i| \geq \sum_{j=1}^m |N_{D_i}(\xi_j)| + \lambda \quad (i = 1, \dots, \pi)$.

Put

$$D = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\pi} D_i, \quad B' = V(T_m) \cap B(T_{k+1}).$$

Clearly,

$$|B'| = \pi + 1, \quad A \cap D = A \cap B' = D \cap B' = \emptyset, \quad |T_m| = |A| + |D| + |B'|.$$

Since $m \geq 3$, we have $|B'| \neq \emptyset$, that is $\pi \geq 0$. By the hypothesis,

$$|D| = \sum_{i=1}^{\pi} |D_i| \geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_D(\xi_i)| + \pi\lambda.$$

By (3),

$$\begin{aligned} |T_m| &= |A| + |D| + |B'| \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^m |N_A(\xi_i)| + m \right) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^m |N_D(\xi_i)| + \pi\lambda \right) + \pi + 1 \\ &\geq \left(\sum_{i=1}^m |N_A(\xi_i)| + \sum_{i=1}^m |N_D(\xi_i)| + \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{B'}(\xi_i)| \right) - \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{B'}(\xi_i)| + m + \pi(\lambda + 1) + 1 \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{T_m}(\xi_i)| - \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{B'}(\xi_i)| + m + \pi(\lambda + 1) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Observing that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{T_m}(\xi_i)| &= \sum_{i=1}^m d(\xi_i) \geq \sigma_m, \\ \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{B'}(\xi_i)| &\leq m|B'| = m(\pi + 1), \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$|T_m| \geq \sigma_m + m + \pi(\lambda + 1) - m(\pi + 1) + 1 = \sigma_m + \pi(\lambda - m + 1) + 1.$$

Since $\pi \geq 0$ and $\lambda \geq m + 1$ (by the hypothesis), we have $|T_m| \geq \sigma_m + 1$ and (2) holds by Claim 5.

Case 2.2. $|D_i| \leq \sum_{j=1}^m |N_{D_i}(\xi_j)| + \lambda - 1$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, \pi\}$.

Assume w.l.o.g. that $i = 1$, that is

$$|D_1| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{D_1}(\xi_i)| + \lambda - 1. \quad (4)$$

Put $T_m(x_1) = H$ and $T_m(y_1) = F$. Assume w.l.o.g. that

$$\text{End}(H) = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_r\}, \quad \text{End}(F) = \{\xi_{r+1}, \xi_{r+2}, \dots, \xi_m\},$$

where $1 \leq r \leq m - 1$.

Claim 10. Let $\xi_i \mu \in E(G)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, say $i = 1$, and $\mu \in D_1 \cup V(F)$. If $\mu \in D_1$ then $|x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu^-| \geq \lambda$. If $\mu \in V(F)$ then $|D_1| \geq \lambda$.

Proof. Put

$$T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_1 \mu - x_1 x_1^+.$$

Assume first that $\mu \in D_1$. If $\mu = x_1^+$ then T'_{k+1} is a k -ended tree of order $|T_{k+1}|$, contradicting Claim 4. Otherwise T'_{k+1} is a $(k+1)$ -ended tree with tailing $x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu^-$. By Claim 3, $|x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu^-| \geq \lambda$.

Now let $\mu \in V(F)$. If $x_1^+ = y_1$ then T'_{k+1} is a k -ended tree of order $|T_{k+1}|$, contradicting Claim 4. Otherwise T'_{k+1} is a $(k+1)$ -ended tree with tailing $x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-$. By Claim 3, $|D_1| \geq \lambda$. $\triangle$

Claim 11. Let $\mu_1 \prec \mu_2$ for some $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in D_1$. If $\xi_i \mu_2, \xi_j \mu_1 \in E(G)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $j \in \{r+1, r+2, \dots, m\}$, then

$$|\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_2^-| \geq \lambda, \quad |x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_1^-| \geq \lambda, \quad |\mu_2^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| \geq \lambda.$$

Proof. Put

$$T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_i \mu_2 + \xi_j \mu_1 - x_1 x_1^+ - \mu_1 \mu_1^+.$$

If $\mu_1^+ = \mu_2$ then T'_{k+1} is a k -ended tree of order $|T_{k+1}|$, contradicting Claim 4. Otherwise T'_{k+1} is a $(k+1)$ -ended tree with tailing $\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_2^-$. By Claim 3, $|\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_2^-| \geq \lambda$.

Now put

$$T''_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_i \mu_2 + \xi_j \mu_1 - x_1 x_1^+ - y_1 y_1^-.$$

If $x_1^+ = \mu_1$ then T''_{k+1} is a k -ended tree of order $|T_{k+1}|$, contradicting Claim 4. Otherwise T''_{k+1} is a $(k+1)$ -ended tree with tailing $x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_1^-$. By Claim 3, $|x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_1^-| \geq \lambda$. By a symmetric argument, $|\mu_2^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| \geq \lambda$. $\triangle$

Claim 12. Let $\mu_1 \prec \mu_2$ for some $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in D_1$ and let $\xi_i \mu_2, \xi_j \mu_1 \in E(G)$ for some distinct $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. If either $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ or $i, j \in \{r+1, r+2, \dots, m\}$, then $|\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_2^-| \geq \lambda$.

Proof. Assume w.l.o.g. that $i, j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Put

$$T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_i \mu_2 + \xi_j \mu_1 - x_1 x_1^+ - \mu_1 \mu_1^+.$$

If $\mu_1^+ = \mu_2$ then T'_{k+1} is a k -ended tree of order $|T_{k+1}|$, contradicting Claim 4. Otherwise T'_{k+1} is a $(k+1)$ -ended tree with tailing $\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_2^-$. By Claim 3, $|\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_2^-| \geq \lambda$. $\triangle$

Claim 13. Let $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and $i \neq j$. Then

$$N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i) \cap N_{D_1}^{-(r-j)}(\xi_j) = \emptyset.$$

Proof. Assume the contrary and let $\mu \in N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i) \cap N_{D_1}^{-(r-j)}(\xi_j)$.

Assume first that $i \leq r$ and $j \geq r+1$. It follows that $\mu_1^{-(r-j)} = \mu_2^{-(r-i)} = \mu$ for some $\mu_1 \in N_{D_1}(\xi_j)$ and $\mu_2 \in N_{D_1}(\xi_i)$. Since $j > i$, we have $\mu_1 \prec \mu_2$. Then

$$|\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_2^-| = (j-r) + (r-i) - 1 = j-i-1 \leq m-2 \leq \lambda-1,$$

contradicting Claim 11.

Now assume that either $i, j \leq r$ or $i, j \geq r+1$, say $i, j \leq r$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $i < j$. It follows that $\mu_1^{-(r-j)} = \mu_2^{-(r-i)} = \mu$ for some $\mu_1 \in N_{D_1}(\xi_j)$ and $\mu_2 \in N_{D_1}(\xi_i)$. Since $i < j$, we have $\mu_1 \prec \mu_2$. Then

$$|\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_2^-| = (r-i) - (r-j) - 1 = j-i-1 \leq r-2 \leq m-3 \leq \lambda-2,$$

contradicting Claim 12. $\triangle$

Claim 14. $N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i) \subseteq D_1$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$).

Proof. If $N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i) = \emptyset$ then we are done. Let $\mu \in N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i)$.

Assume first that $i \leq r$. It follows that $\mu_1^{-(r-i)} = \mu$ for some $\mu_1 \in N_{D_1}(\xi_i)$. By Claim 10, $|x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_1^-| \geq \lambda$. Observing also that $r-i \leq r-1 \leq m-2 \leq \lambda-1$, we conclude that $\mu \in D_1$.

Now assume that $i \geq r+1$. It follows that $\mu_1^{+(i-r)} = \mu$ for some $\mu_1 \in N_{D_1}(\xi_i)$. By Claim 10, $|\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| \geq \lambda$. On the other hand, $i-r \leq m-r \leq m-1 \leq \lambda$. Hence, $\mu \in D_1$. $\triangle$

Case 2.2.1. $\xi_i \mu_1, \xi_j \mu_2 \in E(G)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}, j \in \{r+1, r+2, \dots, m\}$, say $i = 1, j = m$, and $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in D_1$.

By Claims 11 and 12, $|D_1| \geq 2\lambda + 1$. Put

$$X_1 = \{x_1^{+1}, x_1^{+2}, \dots, x_1^{+(\lambda-r+1)}\}, \quad Y_1 = \{y_1^{-1}, y_1^{-2}, \dots, y_1^{-(\lambda-m+r)}\}.$$

Since $|X_1| + |Y_1| = 2\lambda - m + 1 \leq 2\lambda - 2$, we have $X_1 \cup Y_1 \subseteq D_1$ and $X_1 \cap Y_1 = \emptyset$.

Claim 15. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,

$$(X_1 \cup Y_1) \cap N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i) = \emptyset \quad (i = 1, \dots, m).$$

Proof. Assume the contrary and let $\mu \in (X_1 \cup Y_1) \cap N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $i \leq r$. It follows that $\mu_1^{-(r-i)} = \mu$ for some $\mu_1 \in N_{D_1}(\xi_i)$. If $\mu \in X_1$ then

$$|x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_1^-| \leq (\lambda - r + 1) + (r - i) - 1 = \lambda - i \leq \lambda - 1,$$

contradicting Claim 10. Now let $\mu \in Y_1$. By Claim 11 and by the hypothesis (Case 2.2.1), $|\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| \geq \lambda$. Then

$$|Y_1| = \lambda - m + r \geq |\mu \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| = |\mu \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu_1^-| + |\mu_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| + 1 \geq r - i + \lambda + 1,$$

implying that $i \geq m + 1$, a contradiction. $\triangle$

By Claims 14,15 and 16,

$$\begin{aligned} |D_1| &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i)| + |X_1| + |Y_1| \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{D_1}(\xi_i)| + 2\lambda - m + 1 \geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{D_1}(\xi_i)| + \lambda, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting (4).

Case 2.2.2. $\xi_i \mu \in E(G)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, say $i = 1$, and $N_{D_1}(\xi_j) = \emptyset$ for each $j \in \{r+1, r+2, \dots, m\}$.

Assume that ξ_1 and μ are chosen such that $x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu$ is as long as possible.

Case 2.2.2.1. $|\mu^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| \geq \lambda$.

Put

$$X_1 = \{x_1^{+1}, x_1^{+2}, \dots, x_1^{+(\lambda-r+1)}\}, \quad Y_1 = \{y_1^{-1}, y_1^{-2}, \dots, y_1^{-\lambda}\}.$$

Clearly, $X_1 \cap Y_1 = \emptyset$ and $|X_1| + |Y_1| = 2\lambda - r + 1 \geq 2\lambda - m + 2 \geq \lambda + 1$. Since $N_{D_1}(\xi_i) = \emptyset$ for each $i \in \{r+1, r+2, \dots, m\}$, we have $Y_1 \cap N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i) = \emptyset$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. As in Claim 15, we have also $X_1 \cap N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i) = \emptyset$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Recalling also that $N_{D_1}(\xi_i) = \emptyset$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$), we conclude that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$,

$$(X_1 \cup Y_1) \cap N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i) = \emptyset.$$

Then

$$|D_1| \geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{D_1}^{-(r-i)}(\xi_i)| + |X_1| + |Y_1| \geq \sum_{i=1}^m |N_{D_1}(\xi_i)| + \lambda + 1,$$

contradicting (4).

Case 2.2.2.2. $|\mu^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| \leq \lambda - 1$.

Claim 16. $N(\xi_i) \subseteq V(H \cup x_1 \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu)$ ($i = 2, 3, \dots, r$).

Proof. Assume the contrary, that is $\xi_i \mu' \in E(G)$ for some $i \in \{2, \dots, r\}$, say $i = 2$, and $\mu' \in V(F \cup \mu^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1)$. If $\mu' \in V(\mu^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1)$ then by Claim 12, $|\mu^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1| \geq \lambda$, contradicting the hypothesis. Let $\mu' \in V(F)$. Put

$$T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_1 \mu - x_1 x_1^+.$$

Since $\xi_2 \mu' \in E(G)$, by Claim 10, $|\mu^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1| \geq \lambda$, contradicting the hypothesis. $\triangle$

Claim 17. $N(\xi_i) \subseteq V(F)$ ($i = r+1, r+2, \dots, m$).

Proof. Assume the contrary, that is $\xi_i \mu' \in E(G)$ for some $i \in \{r+1, r+2, \dots, m\}$, say $i = m$, and $\mu' \in V(H) \cup D_1$. By the hypothesis (Case 2.2.2), $\mu' \notin D_1$. Let $\mu' \in V(H)$. Put

$$T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_1 \mu - x_1 x_1^+.$$

Since $\xi_m \mu' \in E(G)$, by Claim 10, $|\mu^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| \geq \lambda$, contradicting the hypothesis. $\triangle$

We steel cannot use induction hypothesis with respect to H or F , since possibly $\text{End}(H) \cup \text{End}(F) \not\subseteq \text{End}(T_{k+1})$ and possibly $N(\xi_i) \not\subseteq V(H)$ for some $i \leq r$ or $N(\xi_i) \not\subseteq V(F)$ for some $i \geq r+1$. For this purpose, we shall reform H and F , as well as T_{k+1} to appropriate H' , F' and T'_{k+1} as follows.

If $d_H(x_1) \geq 2$ then $H' = H \cup x_1^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu \xi_1$ and $T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_1 \mu - x_1 x_1^+$. Clearly, $\text{End}(H') = \{\xi_2, \xi_3, \dots, \xi_r, x_1^+\} \subseteq \text{End}(T'_{k+1})$. Since $|\mu^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| \leq \lambda - 1$, by Claim 10, $N(x_1^+) \subseteq V(H')$. Further, by Claim 16, $N(v) \subseteq V(H')$ for each $v \in \text{End}(H')$. Observing also that $|\text{End}(H')| = r \leq m - 1$, we can use the induction hypothesis, that is $|H'| \geq \sigma_r + 1$.

Next, if $d_H(x_1) = 1$ and $w_i^* \neq x_1$, then $H' = H \cup x_1 \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu \xi_1 - w_1 w_1^*$ and $T'_{k+1} = T_{k+1} + \xi_1 \mu - w_1 w_1^*$. Clearly, $\text{End}(H') = \{\xi_2, \dots, \xi_r, w_1\} \subseteq \text{End}(T'_{k+1})$. Since $|\mu^+ \overrightarrow{M_1} y_1^-| \leq \lambda - 1$, by Claim 10, $N(x_1^+) \subseteq V(H')$, implying (by Claim 16) that $N(v) \subseteq V(H')$ for each $v \in \text{End}(H')$. Then we can argue as in Case $d_H(x_1) \geq 2$.

Finally, assume that $d_H(x_1) = 1$ and $w_i^* = x_1$, implying that $r = 1$ and $H = \xi_1 \overrightarrow{Q_1} w_1 w_1^*$. Define $H' = \xi_1 \overrightarrow{Q_1} w_1 x_1 \overrightarrow{M_1} \mu \xi_1$. Clearly, $|H'| \geq d(\xi_1) + 1 \geq \sigma_1 + 1 = \sigma_r + 1$.

Now define F' as follows.

If $d_F(y_1) \geq 2$ then $F' = F$. Clearly, $\text{End}(F') \subseteq \text{End}(T_{k+1})$. By Claim 17, $N(\xi_i) \subseteq V(F)$ ($i = r+1, r+2, \dots, m$). By the induction hypothesis, $|F| \geq \sigma_{m-r} + 1$.

Now let $d_F(y_1) = 1$. If $r = m - 1$, that is $F = \xi_m \overrightarrow{Q_m} w_m w_m^*$ (where $w_m^* = y_1$) then clearly, $|F| \geq \sigma_1 + 1 = \sigma_{m-r} + 1$. Otherwise ($r \leq m - 2$) F has a branch vertex z_1 . Let $\overrightarrow{R_1} = z_1 \overrightarrow{R_1} y_1$ be the path connecting z_1 to y_1 in F . Choose z_1 so that R_1 is as short as possible. Put $F^{(1)} = F - V(R_1 - z_1)$. If $N(\xi_i) \subseteq V(F^{(1)})$ for each $i \in \{r+1, r+2, \dots, m\}$ then by induction hypothesis, $|F| \geq |F^{(1)}| \geq \sigma_{m-r} + 1$. Otherwise, let $\xi_j z_2 \in E(G)$ for some $j \in \{r+1, \dots, m\}$, say $j = r+1$, and $z_2 \in R_1 - z_1$. Put $F^{(2)} = F^{(1)} \cup z_1 \overrightarrow{R_1} z_2 + \xi_{r+1} z_2 - z_1 z_1^+$. Clearly, $\text{End}(F^{(2)}) = \{\xi_{r+2}, \dots, \xi_m, z_1^+\}$. If $N(z_1^+) \subseteq V(F^{(2)})$ then by the induction hypothesis, $|F| \geq |F^{(2)}| \geq \sigma_{m-r} + 1$. Otherwise let $z_1^+ z_3 \in E(G)$ for some $z_3 \in z_2^+ \overrightarrow{R_1} y_1$. Put

$$F^{(3)} = F^{(2)} \cup z_2^+ \overrightarrow{R_1} z_3 + z_1^+ z_3 - z_2 z_2^+.$$

Define $F^{(1)}, F^{(2)}, \dots$ and $z_1, z_2, \dots$ as long as possible and let h be the maximum integer such that $N(z_{h-1}^+) \subseteq \text{End}(F^{(h)})$. It follows that $N(v) \subseteq V(F^{(h)})$ for

each $v \in \text{End}(F^{(h)}) \subset \text{End}(T_{k+1})$. By induction hypothesis, $|F| \geq |F^{(h)}| \geq \sigma_{m-r} + 1$. So, in any case, $|H| \geq \sigma_r + 1$ and $|F| \geq \sigma_{m-r} + 1$. Then

$$|T_m| \geq |H| + |F| \geq \sigma_r + \sigma_{m-r} + 2 \geq \sigma_m + 1,$$

and (2) holds by Claim 5.

Case 2.2.3. $N_{D_1}(\xi_i) = \emptyset$ ($i = 1, \dots, m$).

By the hypothesis (Case 2.2), $|D_1| \leq \lambda - 1$. By Claim 10, $N(\xi_i) \subseteq V(H)$ for each $i \leq r$, and $N(\xi_i) \subseteq V(F)$ for each $i \geq r + 1$. Then we can argue as in Case 2.2.2.

References

- [1] J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty, Graph Theory with Applications, Macmillan, London and Elsevier, New York (1976).
- [2] H. Broersma and H. Tuinstra, Independence trees and Hamilton cycles, J. Graph Theory 29 (1998) 227-237.
- [3] M. Las Vergnas, Sur une propriété des arbres maximaux dans un graphe, C.R. Acad.Sci.Paris Sér. A 272 (1971) 1297-1300.
- [4] Zh.G. Nikoghosyan, Two theorems on spanning trees, Uchenie Zapiski EGU (Scientific Transactions of the Yerevan StatUniversity), Ser. Matematika, issue 3 (1976) 3-6 (in Russian).
- [5] O. Ore, A note on hamiltonian circuits, Am. Math. Month. 67 (1960) 55.

Institute for Informatics and Automation Problems
National Academy of Sciences
P. Sevak 1, Yerevan 0014, Armenia
E-mail: zhora@ipia.sci.am